

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22  
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1, TO DEC. 31, 2000—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Max Baucus .....	Dollar .....		755.14		5,269.89				755.14
Lorenzo Goco .....	Dollar .....		1,034.00		5,269.89				5,269.89
Zak Anderson .....	Dollar .....		1,274.00		5,269.89				1,274.00
James Barnett .....	Dollar .....		1,947.00		5,269.89				5,269.89
Patricia McNerney .....	Dollar .....		1,947.00		5,208.00				1,947.00
	Dollar .....				3,609.30				5,208.00
									1,947.00
									3,609.30
Total .....			19,340.14		50,149.24				69,489.38

RICHARD SHELBY,  
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, Feb. 1, 2001.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22  
U.S.C. 1754(b), THE MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM SEPT. 21, TO SEPT. 22, 2000

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Kay Bailey Hutchinson: Mexico .....	Pesos .....		146.25						146.25
Senator Jon Kyl: Mexico .....	Pesos .....		146.25						146.25
Senator Jeff Sessions: Mexico .....	Pesos .....		146.25						146.25
Larry DiRita: Mexico .....	Pesos .....		146.25						146.25
Mike Gerber: Mexico .....	Pesos .....		146.25						146.25
Julia Hart: Mexico .....	Pesos .....		146.25						146.25
Delegation expenses <sup>1</sup> .....								428.63	428.63
Total .....			877.50					428.63	1,306.13

<sup>1</sup> Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

TRENT LOTT,  
Majority Leader, Nov. 15, 2000.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22  
U.S.C. 1754(b), DEMOCRATIC LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2000

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Franz Wuerfmannsdorbler: Netherlands .....	Dollar .....		3,359.28						3,359.28
Total .....			3,359.28						3,359.28

TOM DASCHLE,  
Democratic Leader, Jan. 31, 2001.

## THE FUTURE OF INDO-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the powerful earthquake which recently devastated India's densely populated western state of Gujarat has focused our attention, once again, on India. Gujarat officials estimate that 28,000 to 30,000 people have died. Thousands more have been injured, and hundreds of thousands have been displaced.

In response to India's dire need for help, USAID has sent blankets, generators, water containers, plastic sheeting, food, and other relief supplies—all part of our official commitment to provide some \$10 million in emergency humanitarian aid. But in my view this is not enough. We can and should do more. In the initial phase of this disaster when India particularly needed search and rescue teams and medical assistance, the United States was con-

spicuous in its absence. The Russians, the Brits, the Swiss and others were engaged in pulling people out of the rubble. We were not. At least half a dozen countries, including Denmark, Israel, and Sweden, sent field hospitals, doctors and medical personnel. We did not. Given our slow start, it is especially important for the United States to be particularly generous when it comes to reconstruction.

Indian-Americans, on the other hand, have moved quickly to mobilize their own relief effort—collecting sizeable donations and medical supplies as well as assembling teams of doctors. Reflecting the depth of concern among Americans for the tragedy that has struck India, President Bush, last week, made a condolence call to Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee. I commend the President for making this call, not only because it was the

right thing to do under the circumstances, but also because it was an important gesture by the new Administration toward a country in a region that the United States tends to ignore, except in times of crisis.

Regrettably the Clinton Administration paid little attention to developments in South Asia until May 1998, when India broke its 25 year moratorium on nuclear testing with five underground tests. Taken by surprise, the Administration tried—to no avail—to persuade Pakistan not to test in response. Confronted with escalating tensions not only in the nuclear realm but on the ground over Kashmir, the Administration was forced to focus on growing instability in the subcontinent.

Belatedly the Administration picked up the pace of its diplomacy in the region, opening a high level dialogue

with India and Pakistan on nuclear issues, interceding to reduce tensions over Kashmir, and arranging a Presidential visit last March to India, with a brief stop in Pakistan. President Clinton's trip to India—the first by a US president in 22 years—was an effort, in his words, to “rekindle the relationship” between the United States and India. It was a welcome initiative.

I was in India in December 1999, a few months before President Clinton's visit, to participate in the World Economic Forum's India Economic Summit. While there, I had an opportunity to meet with a number of Indian officials including the Prime Minister, his National Security Adviser and the Defense Minister. During the course of these meetings, it became very clear to me that India wanted a better relationship with the United States. In many respects, this was predictable because from India's perspective, the neighborhood in which it lives has become less friendly and more threatening, and its historical ally, the Soviet Union, no longer exists.

Pakistan is under the control of a military regime rather than a democratically elected government—a regime which New Delhi views as illegitimate and threatening. In the months before the Clinton visit, tensions with Pakistan had intensified not only over Kashmir but also over Pakistani support for terrorists. Although tensions have subsided since then, Kashmir continues to be a volatile issue that could provoke another war between India and Pakistan both armed with nuclear weapons. Pakistan, like India, has declared its intention to be in the nuclear game. Pakistan clearly poses a security problem for India but not of the magnitude of China. As one Indian told me during my visit, “Pakistan is a nuisance but not a threat—China is a threat.”

The biggest and from the Indian viewpoint most menacing power in the neighborhood is China—a country with which India has had longstanding tensions over border and territorial issues. China's past assistance to Pakistan's nuclear program and its ongoing efforts to build influence with other smaller countries in the region, particularly those on India's border such as Burma, are proof at least in the minds of Indians that China is trying to encircle India. Whereas most of the countries in Southeast Asia see Chinese aspirations as limited to that of a regional power that wants recognition and respect, India is wary of China's aspirations both in the region and globally.

The Indian fear of China seems to me to be larger than reality but it is real nonetheless, and it is a major reason why India has been seeking improved relations with the United States. The Clinton Administration, recognizing that improved relations would be in America's interests as well as India's, wisely took advantage of this opportunity. India is the largest democracy

in Asia and a potentially important partner in our efforts to promote regional stability, economic growth and more open political systems in surrounding countries. It is a fledgling nuclear power with the potential to affect the nuclear balance in South Asia as well as our nonproliferation goals on a global level. It is involved in a longstanding conflict with Pakistan which could erupt into another war possibly at the nuclear level. It is a player in a region dominated by China, with whom the US has mutual interests but also major differences.

While the United States and India have differences over serious issues related to the development of India's nuclear program, labor and the environment, Cold War politics and alliances no longer stand in the way of improved relations. In fact, as many of my Indian hosts suggested, the United States and India are “natural allies”. Both are vibrant democracies; Indian-American family ties are strong and extensive. As India has begun to open and liberalize its economy over the past decade, American business and investment in India has grown, particularly in the high tech region of Bangalore, and America has become India's largest trading partner and source of foreign investment. And on the flip side, Indians are playing a major role in the growth of our high tech industry in California, Massachusetts, New York, and elsewhere. Together with the Taiwanese, Indians own more than 25 percent of the firms and supply more than 25 percent of the labor in this country in those technology fields. All of India's political parties have accepted the need to continue India's economic modernization. Undoubtedly there will be disagreements over how to do it but continuation of the process holds out the prospects of increased economic interaction with the United States.

The potential exists for the U.S. and India to have a strong, cooperative relationship across a broad range of issues. President Clinton's visit to India was an important step in laying the foundation for this new relationship. Working groups were set up on trade, clean energy and environment, and science and technology. A broad range of environmental, social and health agreements were signed. To strengthen economic ties, \$2 billion in Eximbank support for U.S. exports to India was announced; U.S. firms signed some \$4 billion in agreements with Indian firms. The effort to institutionalize dialogue was capped by an agreement between President Clinton and Prime Minister Vajpayee for regular bilateral summits between the leaders of both countries. An invitation was extended to the Prime Minister to visit Washington, which he did last September. During that visit, the two leaders agreed to expand cooperation to the areas of arms control, terrorism and AIDS.

The seeds have been sown for a new Indo-American relationship. It is up to

the Bush Administration to nurture them. The Administration must devote time and attention to the relationship—and to developments in the region—on a consistent basis, not on a crisis only basis. President Clinton and Prime Minister Vajpayee set out to regularize bilateral contacts not only at the working level but also at the highest levels. President Bush should continue this process. Personal diplomacy at the highest levels, particularly when dealing with Asian countries, is an essential element of relationship-building. I also believe that the time is long overdue for the United States to distinguish, once and for all, between India and Pakistan and to treat each differently and according to the demands of those bilateral relationships.

A constant source of irritation for Indians has been the inability or unwillingness of the United States to differentiate between India and Pakistan. From their perspective, India's commitment to democracy and economic reform dictate that the United States have a different relationship with India than with Pakistan, which has a military regime that supports terrorism. I agree that a distinction must be drawn. That the United States lumps them together or even worse is soft on Pakistan is clearly unacceptable from the Indian point of view. To a certain extent, they have a point. To a certain extent, they have made their point accurately.

Just as the passing of the Cold War has improved the atmosphere for an improvement in Indo-American relations, it has also removed the need for the United States to ignore Pakistan's transgressions both within and outside of its borders. The United States no longer needs to tilt toward Pakistan in pursuit of larger strategic objectives. We should look at our relationships with India and Pakistan separately, analyzing each in terms of mutual interests and differences and being more candid in defining areas of agreement and disagreement. President Clinton attempted to find a new balance during his trip last year, by spending several days in India and only a few hours in Islamabad. But more needs to be done. In my view, we can advance our interests and strengthen our relationship with India by immediately terminating the sanction on loans to India from international financial institutions (IFIs).

Although President Clinton waived most of the sanctions imposed on India after it tested in 1998, he chose not to exercise the waiver for IFI loans to India, amounting to some \$1.7 billion, or for FMF (foreign military financing) for India. I believe that we should lift the IFI sanction at this time. The release of these funds would send an important signal to India of our ongoing commitment to improved relations while also encouraging the government of India to continue its economic modernization.

The sanction on FMF needs discussion in hopes of finding further progress regarding India's position on nuclear issues. At the moment, Indian officials have made it clear that there would be no rollback of India's nuclear program and that India intends to have a credible minimum nuclear deterrent which means nuclear weapons and delivery systems. They believe that the United States is under-emphasizing India's security needs and overemphasizing nonproliferation objectives. I believe there is a happy medium between these two. Although there has been ongoing dialogue between Indian and American officials on the Clinton Administration's four nonproliferation benchmarks set after the 1998 tests—signing and ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), halting fissile material production, refraining from deploying or testing missiles or nuclear weapons, and instituting export controls on sensitive goods and technology.

Despite the fact that we set up these benchmarks, the truth is there has been little progress made with respect to them.

We must be frank and acknowledge at the same time, as we see and measure the progress, that we have to be honest about our own status, if you will. That requires us to acknowledge that our failure in the Senate to approve the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty has undermined our ability to influence India and many other countries. And Pakistan, obviously, is in the same equation.

Nevertheless, it is imperative that the dialog continue because too much is at stake in terms of regional stability and nonproliferation to allow it to wither. We need to understand the fears that are driving India's sense of security and insecurity. We need to ask ourselves what is realistic to expect from India in light of those fears.

For their part, the Indians must understand that much can be gained in the relationship with the United States and with progress on these issues. Arms control and regional stability are inextricably linked, and global security is inextricably linked to our resolution of these issues.

I am very hopeful we can quickly reach a mutual understanding to permit the FMF sanction to also be lifted. I believe we can make progress on these difficult issues if both parties are prepared to tackle them and to be sensitive to understanding the other's security concerns.

India and the United States have begun to build a new cooperative relationship that reflects our common ties and our common interests. A process has begun, and the administration needs to continue that progress with commitment and with zeal.

India and the United States have an enormous amount to offer each other. We both can benefit, in my judgment, from a more cooperative and friendly working relationship. I think the

groundwork has been laid. I hope this administration can move rapidly to lift the current sanctions, to enter into the talks, and to move forward in this most critical relationship. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in a period for morning business, with Members allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. KENNEDY pertaining to the introduction of S. 277 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 235

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m. on Thursday, the Senate proceed to S. 235, the pipeline safety bill and all amendments be relevant to the subject matter of pipeline safety or energy policy in California or a study relative to energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, in light of this agreement, I announce to the Members of the Senate that there will be no further votes today.

#### MODIFICATION OF S. RES. 7

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adoption of S. Res. 7, the resolution be modified to reflect the following changes which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The modification reads as follows:

#### MODIFICATION

Designating Senator Larry Craig as chairman of the Committee on Aging;

Designating Senator Pat Roberts as Chairman of the Committee on Ethics;

Designating Senator Harry Reid as Vice Chairman of the Committee on Ethics;

Designating Senator Inouye as Vice Chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE REPRESENTATION

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 279 regarding the membership of the Joint Economic Committee.

Further, I ask that the bill be read the third time and passed, with the motion to reconsider laid upon the table.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill (S. 279) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 279

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, and specifically section 5(a) of the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1024(a)), the Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate shall for the duration of the One Hundred Seventh Congress, for so long as the majority party and the minority party have equal representation in the Senate, be represented by five Members of the majority party and five Members of the minority party.

#### APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 106-553, announces the appointment of the following Senators to serve as members of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Awards Board: The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT).

The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84 and Public Law 106-292, appoints the following Senators to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council for the 107th Congress: The Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS).

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2001

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 8. I further ask consent that on Thursday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and then the Senate proceed to a period for morning business until 11 a.m., to be divided in the following manner: Senator TORRICELLI, in control of the time between 9:30 a.m. and 10 a.m.; Senator DURBIN, or his designee, controlling the time between 10 a.m. and